

EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group
Meeting Summary
September 24, 2001

Members Attending: Anjali Mathur, Kevin Snape, Kathleen Gaiser, Stuart Greenberg, Glenn Landers, Bill Skowronski, Rev. Smith, Laura Hobson, Tim Nieberding, Eleanor Bycoski, Tom McLeary, Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Paige Akins, Jacquie Gillon, Hollie Dellisanti, Emily Lee, Ron Kunkle, Mike Suver, Dennis Finn, Elizabeth Shaw, Richard King, Bob Leidich, Joe Calabrese, Bill Davis,

Members Absent: Marty Gelfand, Amy Ryder, Virginia Aveni, Michael Krzywicki, Rev. Hockett, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domanovic, Mamie Bell

Facilitators: Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman, and Allison Berland

The Ohio Air Toxics Working Group convened for the fourth time at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University. The facilitators began by reviewing the agenda and noted that they would be preparing this meeting summary.

Review of Past Meeting Summaries and Outstanding Action Items

The facilitators reviewed the status of the meeting summaries for the first three meetings. The Working Group approved the June meeting summary, and requested that the July meeting summary be resent for review. CBI will also revise the EPA website address in the August meeting summary, which is incorrect.

There were no questions regarding outstanding action items.

Measures of Success

The evaluator for the pilot, Juliana Birkhoff, gave a presentation on Measures of Success (still in draft form) for the Cleveland Air Toxics Working Group. The EPA has three objectives for this pilot project: risk reduction from air toxics in Cleveland, replicability and sustainability. The goal of the evaluation is to find out what worked for this pilot, what didn't work for this pilot and to see how its implementation might be improved elsewhere.

One member commented that there is a greater chance of success in risk reduction if an action is adopted that addresses citywide rather than only neighborhood-specific air toxics. Another member suggested that the Measures of Success should make a distinction between process indicators and outcome indicators. A few members expressed concern about the role of the EPA after this project. The evaluator noted that the EPA would not go away -- their local and regional offices would still have their current regulatory responsibilities -- but the level their active involvement in the pilot activities would decrease.

Juliana will take comments on the draft Measures of Success. She can be reached at jbirkhoff@igc.org or 703-560-6304. CBI will make available copies of Juliana's presentation overheads by email.

Report from Transportation Subcommittee

Kathleen Gaiser, coordinator, reported on the first meeting of the transportation subcommittee. The subcommittee has four proposals under consideration:

- Technology to Reduce Toxics from RTA Buses: Retrofit 10 circular buses by installing particulate filters and switching to low-sulfur diesel fuel.
- Increase Awareness and Ridership of Transit Program: Promote bus usage by identifying new incentives for using transit such as business endorsement/sponsorship for free bus passes.
- Exchange/Trade-In for Old Gas Caps and Gas Cans: Organize a give-away program that encourages neighborhood residents to exchange their old gasoline containers and leaky caps with new ones.
- Rental Project: Provide easy access to renting lawn mowers.

The subcommittee identified some data that they need: demographic data, traffic patterns and usage, and automotive patterns. Following Kathleen's presentation, Working Group members had the following comments:

- In the business committee, we are talking about truck idling, wondering if that is something the two committees could work on together.
- Q: Why do trucks idle? A: Along time ago it was difficult to get diesel vehicles started again, now that is not the case.
- There are citywide initiatives that target neighborhoods in the city; we need to look at projects that maximize reduction.
- Q: Did you look at the issue of emissions reduction of RTA? A: Yes, we're looking at reducing emissions of circular buses in the neighborhoods.
- Q: Regarding changing the type of fuel use, would natural gas be more efficient? A: RTA has natural gas vehicles, but can't have it in smaller vehicles due to capacity problem. There are also cost-benefit tradeoffs with natural gas vehicles versus improved diesel vehicles.

Report from Schools Subcommittee

Emily Lee, coordinator, reported on the first meeting of the Schools Subcommittee. The subcommittee talked about goals, brainstormed about projects, data needs and discussed what schools are already doing. The subcommittee identified four categories of projects:

- Education/Awareness of school community: possible projects include getting information to students/teachers about the use of green materials, and educating boards of education about the impacts of building materials on indoor air quality.
- Student Focused projects: possible projects include educating new drivers through driver's education courses about the environmental impacts of their driving behavior, and enlisting student help to get radon test kits out to families for home testing.
- Tools for Schools/infrastructure/indoor air quality: possible projects include conducting a hazardous waste collection campaign in the schools.
- Transportation: possible projects include encouraging school community to look at their transportation behavior.

The subcommittee has identified several schools in the two neighborhoods: Case, Wilson, East, Union, Willow, AB Hart, South and Mound.

Report from Business Subcommittee

Dennis Finn reported on the first meeting of the Business Subcommittee: The Subcommittee identified several possible projects:

- Improvement in the national emissions inventory
- Specific Commitments that companies at the table could make
- Long-term monitoring such as looking at transportation into the two neighborhoods
- Toxic Reduction Plan: Work with smaller businesses that don't have the information about alternative cleaning materials or solvent replacements
- EPA pollution prevention program
- Tax incentives to install pollution prevention equipment
- Diesel idling and fleet retrofit: business and transportation are working on this together

One member asked if the subcommittee is compiling a list of businesses by size. Another member replied that this information should be available at the downtown library.

Report from Home Subcommittee

Emily Lee reported on the first meeting of the Home Subcommittee. From a list provided by the EPA of air toxics, the subcommittee identified two hazards, radon and second-hand smoke, that are of most concern. The Subcommittee identified the following possible projects:

- Household Toxics Collection Campaign: focus on banned pesticides, mercury thermometers, old gasoline containers
- Radon: outreach campaign to community that would include the following: encourage use of the in-house radon test, send in the test to EPA for results, and bring in an EPA radon specialist to help fix or mitigate homes when high levels of radon are found.

Draft Evaluation Matrix and Decision Criteria

The facilitators reviewed and discussed the draft evaluation matrix. The idea behind the matrix is for members to have a tool to compare projects and to make decisions about which projects to move forward on. Members generally felt that this was a useful tool to help sort out projects. Some members expressed concern that when it comes down to how to allocate resources across subcommittees, it is going to be “comparing apples to oranges.” The facilitator suggested that a broad set of principles might be helpful in the future to help with making decisions. The EPA encouraged members to support projects that they are excited about. The facilitators will revise the evaluation matrix and distribute it to the Working Group at the October meeting.

Working Group Charge to Subcommittees

Working Group members discussed the Charge for Subcommittees--the list of actions needed to implement air toxics reduction projects by subcommittees and the Working Group. Facilitators presented a list of tasks and asked members what their impression was of the list and how much the subcommittees could realistically accomplish by Thanksgiving. The Working Group had the following comments:

- Subcommittees will not move at the same pace in terms of identifying and selecting projects.
- Realistically, subcommittees can accomplish brainstorming tasks by December 2001 (identifying projects, ranking projects, identifying data and resource needs to evaluate or chose among projects). Additional selection and implementation tasks will have to occur in 2002.
- Generally, it was discussed that the pilot would likely be able to have actions significantly underway by late spring to June 2002.

The facilitators will incorporate these comments and distribute a revised charge to the Working Group at the October meeting.

Scheduling Next Meeting

The Working Group agreed on Monday, October 29, 2001, as the next date for the Ohio Air Toxics Working Group. The next meeting will be held at the Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University. Subcommittees can meet from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., followed by the full Working Group meeting from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. A date for November was not selected, but the facilitators recommended considering a Tuesday for those who cannot make Monday meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 9 p.m. Please note that EPA's website for this pilot is at <http://www.epa.gov/cleveland/>